



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/996,244

11/28/2001

Daniel Richard Schaefer

594826-001

3771

27805

7590

05/08/2007

THOMPSON HINE L.L.P.

P.O. BOX 8801

DAYTON, OH 45401-8801

EXAMINER

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 05/08/2007

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The reply filed on 1/22/07 is still not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because: contrary to the 11/3/06 Notice of Non-compliance with 37 CFR 1.192(c), appellant has not corrected the deficiencies in said Notice. The appellant has also not corrected some of the deficiencies cited in the 1/04/05 and 2/16/05 Notices of Non-compliance.

As to the deficiencies in the 1/22/07 Appeal Brief that were identified in the 11/3/06 Notice, appellant has still not corrected the: a) inaccuracy in the Summary of Invention, and b) impropriety of the arguments regarding the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection of the claims.

As to item a), Summary of Invention (Section V) in the 1/22/07 Appeal Brief, states:

"After the spectrographical analysis and "stripping" away of the interfering gamma ray emission counts, the presence of a pure beta emitter in the fullerene was seen (page 9, lines 18-20.) Underlining provided.

This is still inaccurate. Firstly, the cited part of the specification neither uses nor refers to the term, "seen." Secondly, the term, "seen" means "an act or state of having found or observed something." Based on appellant's specification, he did not find or observe that neutrons can be trapped inside a fullerene molecule but rather **ONLY INFERRED or SURMISED** such trapping based on an alleged presence of a pure beta emitter, as evidenced by the following statement:

"Evidence that neutrons are trapped in the fullerene molecules consists of the presence of a pure beta emitter in the fullerene that remains after the counts resulting from the gamma emitters have been stripped from the raw data. The pure beta emitter has a half life anywhere near ten minutes. There are very few pure beta particle emitters with a half life anywhere near ten minutes. The rarity of these pure beta emitters, their chemical nature, and the chemical nature of the fullerene all point to the conclusion that they cannot be the source of the pure beta

Art Unit: 3663

emitter observed in the irradiated fullerene. The only other possible source of the radiation is the decay of free neutrons." see page 7, lines 18+ of the specification.

As to item b), the deficiencies in appellant's arguments, which were cited in the 11/03/06 Notice, still have not been corrected in the 1/22/07 Appeal Brief. (The same deficiencies were also previously cited separately in 1/04/05 Notice and in the 2/16/05 Notice). Appellant's arguments are still defective because are based on features that are neither in the claims nor in the specification. For example, appellant argues that each of the claims 4-8, 10-14 and 16-19 is directed to a specific embodiment or particular property, but neither one has a basis in the disclosure.

For instance, appellant states:

"Claim 4 is directed to the embodiment in which the trapped neutron is defined as being in an accelerated state characterized by higher energy levels." Underlining provided.

An embodiment, which is equivalent to a species, is a suitable alternative (by itself alone) for exercising the claimed invention (see MPEP 806.04(e)). However, there is no mention at all in the specification that such acceleration of neutrons inside a fullerene molecule is an "embodiment" of the claimed invention.

In another instance, appellant states:

"Claim 7 is directed to the embodiment wherein the free thermal neutrons have the property that they are useful as an irradiation target for bombardment by other particles. Underlining provided.

Again, there is no mention of such embodiment or species in the specification. Also, there is no disclosure of what is this so-called property that makes it useful for the alleged purpose.

Additionally, each of claims 4-8, 10-14 and 16-19 is recited as being directed to an embodiment. If such is an accurate representation of the claims, which is not the case, then there are fourteen (14) embodiments of the claimed invention. Some or all of these embodiments (or species) would be distinct, and the examiner would have subjected the original application to an election of species requirement, as per MPEP 806.04(f). No such restriction was issued because said 14 claims are not directed to 14 separate embodiments.

The presentation and discussion regarding "repetitive sample experiments" and testing of "irradiated fullerene samples" at page 14 of the 1/22/07 Appeal Brief, have previously been cited as defective in 1/04/05 Notice and in the 2/16/05 Notice because they represent new evidence. This deficiency continues to exist in the 1/22/07 Appeal Brief.

Since the period for reply set forth in the prior Office action has expired, this application will become abandoned unless applicant corrects the deficiency and obtains an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a).

The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. In no case may an applicant reply outside the SIX (6) MONTH statutory period or obtain an extension for more than FIVE (5) MONTHS beyond the date for reply set forth in an Office action. A fully responsive reply must be timely filed to avoid abandonment of this application.


The examiner notes that appellant's response to the 1/11/2007 Notice of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief issued by the Appeal Center does not override the above-cited non-corrected deficiencies. The Appeals Center reviews submissions from appellants for obvious errors before sending them to the examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rick Palabrica whose telephone number is 571-272-6880. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00-4:30, Mon-Thurs.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Keith can be reached on 571-272-6878. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RJP
May 4, 2007


RICARDO J. PALABRICA
PRIMARY EXAMINER